

## Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of January 10, 2007

**Members Present:** Amanda Starcher, Jay Winer, Todd Williams, Suzanne Jones, Diane Duermit , John Cram, Marsha Shortell, Rob Moody, Scott Riviere, Jackson Bebbler, Alice Coppedge

**Members Absent:** Cheryl McMurry, Alice Keller, Lupe Perez

**Staff:** Stacy Merten, Curt Euler, Jennifer Blevins

**Public:** Justin Ried, Day Dantzler, Gray Reese, Shawn Lynch, Chuck Pickering, A.W. Baker, John Kisner

**Call to Order:** Chair Winer called the meeting to order at 4:07 p.m. with a quorum present.

**Adoption of Minutes:** Commissioner Shortell made a motion to adopt the December, 2006 minutes as written.  
Second by: Commissioner Cram  
Vote for: All

### Public Hearings:

Agenda Item	
<b>Owner/Applicant :</b>	Kessler Asheville II, LLC
<b>Subject Property:</b>	11 Lodge Street
<b>Hearing Date:</b>	January 10, 2007
<b>Historic District:</b>	Biltmore Village
<b>PIN:</b>	9648.19-60-4028, 9648.19-60-3077
<b>Zoning District:</b>	CB-II
<b>Other Permits:</b>	Demolition
<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She told the Commissioners that the applicant intends to demolish the structure in order to redevelop the site.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Justin Ried, representing Kessler Asheville II, LLC, said that the property will be enhanced with a new structure.
Public Comment	
Speaker Name	Issue(s)
None	
Commission Comments/Discussion	
The Commissioners agreed that the building should be demolished because it does not contribute to the integrity of the district.	

## Commission Action

### MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – photograph; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 28<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2006, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 22<sup>nd</sup> day of December, 2006 as indicated by Exhibits B and C.
2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.
3. Application is to demolish existing non-contributing structure. **All necessary permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**
4. The *Biltmore Village Development Plan*, May 1992, was used to evaluate this request.
5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:
  1. The Development Plan contemplates redevelopment of this site.
  2. The structure targeted for demolition is a non-contributing structure to the historic district.
6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Biltmore Village Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Shortell

Second by: Commissioner Duermit

Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Shortell

Second by: Commissioner Cram

Vote for: All

### Agenda Item

<b>Owner/Applicant:</b> Alex & David Baker <b>Subject Property:</b> 222 Flint Street <b>Hearing Date:</b> January 10, 2007 <b>Historic District:</b> Montford <b>PIN:</b> 9649.13-13-5452 <b>Zoning District:</b> RM-8 <b>Other Permits:</b> Building	
<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She told the Commissioners that although the Building Safety Department might allow the code violation to remain, the applicant would like to make the change because several of her family members are tall and the reduced head clearance would be a problem. She said the State Historic Preservation Office advised the owners to retain the staircase because it is the only original interior feature remaining. She said that the guidelines prohibit changing original window and door openings, but explained that they do allow the Commission to vary from them if they clearly state the reasons why the proposed improvements are congruous.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Alex Baker, the owner, asked the Commissioners to grant her request. She stated that her contractor explored some other solutions, but this proposal seemed to be the best.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	
<b>Commission Comments/Discussion</b>	
The Commissioners discussed some possible alternatives to moving the window and the wall. Ms. Baker explained that they wouldn't work because of the floor plan and new plumbing work already completed. Commissioner Starcher suggested another solution that would only affect the interior and would maintain the integrity of the staircase and the window. Ms. Baker said she would still rather move the window because the wall was already framed and plumbing in place. Several Commissioners said that they would not be inclined to approve the application because there were alternatives that would not affect the window or staircase. Ms. Baker requested a continuance so that she could consult with her contractor.	
<b>Commission Action</b>	
Commissioner Shortell made a motion to continue the hearing until the February 14, 2007 meeting. Second by: Commissioner Duermit Vote for: All	

## Preliminary Review:

### Agenda Item

<b>Owner/Applicant :</b>	Kessler Asheville II, LLC
<b>Subject Property:</b>	11 Lodge Street
<b>Hearing Date:</b>	January 10, 2007
<b>Historic District:</b>	Biltmore Village
<b>PIN:</b>	9648.19-60-4028, 9648.19-60-3077
<b>Zoning District:</b>	CB-II
<b>Other Permits:</b>	Demolition
<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Day Dantzler, representing the applicant, gave the Commissioners an overview of the project. He said the materials would all be the same as those approved for the main hotel building across the street. Gray Reese, project architect, gave a slide presentation including the site plan, floor plans, elevations and massing studies. Justin Ried, also representing the applicant, passed around the paint colors and samples of the brick and roof shingle. Shawn Lynch, project engineer, clarified that the sidewalk would be a minimum of 5' wide.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	
<b>Commission Comments/Discussion</b>	
Chair Winer asked the Commissioners to state any concerns about the project design. Commissioner Coppedge asked the applicants to provide a more detailed drawing of the exterior finish at their next review. Some of the Commissioners were concerned that the two new buildings might create a canyon effect because they were too close to the street. Some said that the structure did not fit well in the context of the village and seemed too large or too heavy. Others complimented the architect and applicants on the design and materials. Commissioner Moody and several others requested a storyboard showing the proposed annex, the previously approved main building, New Morning Gallery and the Biltmore Estate office building.	
<b>Commission Action</b>	
None	

### Agenda Item

<b>Owner/Applicant :</b> John Kisner <b>Subject Property:</b> 98 A Flint Street <b>Hearing Date:</b> January 10, 2007 <b>Historic District:</b> Montford <b>PIN:</b> 9649.17-22-3163 <b>Zoning District:</b> RM-8 <b>Other Permits:</b> Building & Zoning	
<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	John Kisner, project architect, explained that the non-original shed addition would be removed and replaced with a wing as shown on the Sanborn map. He asked whether the wing should be placed in the same position as the original, which would encroach into the required setback, or further forward on the house to avoid the encroachment. The Commissioners agreed that it would be appropriate to apply flexible development to allow the encroachment because the footprint would closely match that of the original house. Mr. Kisner passed out copies of elevation drawings for a proposed new carriage house to be used as an apartment.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	
<b>Commission Comments/Discussion</b>	
The Commissioners were all concerned about the plan to construct a 2-story accessory structure on the same parcel with a 1-story house. They requested a storyboard showing the relationship between the existing house, proposed carriage house and the houses behind the lot. Ms. Merten read from the guidelines stating that the proportion of outbuildings should be compatible with the proportion of the main house and that typically these buildings were smaller in scale than the main house. The Commissioners told Mr. Kisner that he would need to find and document a precedent existing in the neighborhood in order for them to consider approval.	
<b>Commission Action</b>	
None	

### **Other Business:**

Ms. Merten asked the Commissioners to contact her with their comments on the St. Dunstan's draft guidelines. She asked if the green building sub-committee would also work on the guidelines and they agreed. She informed the Commissioners of City Council's decision to postpone the vote on designation of the St. Dunstan's neighborhood so that they could review information on affordable housing in historic districts.

Chair Winer adjourned the meeting at 6:40 p.m.